

NOVA SCOTIA
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY



PROVINCE HOUSE

6275 A

FIRST LECTURE,
BEFORE THE
PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,
OF NOVA SCOTIA.
BY REV. A. KING. A.M.

04

PROTESTANT ALLIANCE LECTURES.

THE PAPACY:

A

CONSPIRACY AGAINST
CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

FIRST LECTURE,

DELIVERED BEFORE THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE,
OF NOVA SCOTIA.

AT TEMPERANCE HALL, HALIFAX, ON FRIDAY EVENING,
DECEMBER 17th, 1858.

BY REV. ANDREW KING, A. M.
FREE COLLEGE, HALIFAX.

1783-1872

HALIFAX, N. S.:

PRINTED AT THE WESLEYAN CONFERENCE STEAM PRESS.
1859.

NS

282.0x

K

TR

2437

THE PAPACY.

BY PROFESSOR KING.

THE title of this Lecture, which has been stated, not by myself, but by those who drew out the plan of this course, may be viewed in two different aspects. It may be taken as a proposition with the affirmative word understood; and which, when fully expressed, would constitute this assertion,—“THE PAPACY is a conspiracy against civil and religious liberty.” Taken in this sense, it would be required that we should lay the subject before you as persons who deny, or who at least may not be prepared to admit the truth of the proposition; and the object would be to establish it by proofs. The other aspect in which the title may be viewed is that in which, according to the plain and simple meaning of the words in which it is expressed, no affirmation is made, but a subject simply is proposed,—“The Papacy—a conspiracy against civil and religious liberty.” It takes it for granted that the Papacy is such a conspiracy, and it wishes you to look at it in this character. Addressing myself, as I understand I am now doing, to Protestants, I shall so far respect the profession under which you appear here as to take it for granted that you have a general understanding of the meaning of that Protest on the ground of which, as adhering to its principles, we are called Protestants. I will not enter upon a formal proof, to which justice could not be done within the compass of a single Lecture. But, in inviting you to look at the object that is thus described, I will endeavour so to pre-

sent it, as that no intelligent and impartial listener can fail to be impressed with the conviction that, deny it who may, the papal system is the most stupendous conspiracy ever formed against civil and religious liberty. In speaking of it, however, as a conspiracy, I am not to be held as ascribing either the animus or the conduct of conspirators to all the members of that system. As is generally the case in conspiracies, many may be associated with the band who may be altogether unconscious of the treasonable nature of the plot, many may be employed as instruments to help it on who are little aware of the use that is made of them. But whatever may be the views of individuals—amid the changes which in the lapse of ages may take place in the agents—notwithstanding the change of tactics which may at times have been adopted—allowing for all the variety of motives, some good and some bad, by which individual actors may have been influenced, *conspiracy* is the appropriate term to be employed, in speaking of that ecclesiastico-political association, the Church of Rome, with the Pope at its head in all his assumed infallibility and supremacy. All is directed, and is made to conspire towards the accomplishment of his own ends, by that spirit spoken of in scripture, as the old serpent, and as the great red dragon with seven heads and ten horns, which has its central seat in the seven hilled city, and which exercises its power, and directs the movements of its varied instruments to secure this, “That as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed; and that no one might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” Rev. xiii. 15, 17.

1. Let us, in the first place, then, look at some of those peculiar principles of the Papal Church which go to establish and illustrate her character as a conspiracy against civil and religious liberty. On this part of our subject, we perhaps cannot begin more appropriately than with the Creed of Pope

Pius IV. ; in which he sums up the faith of the Romish Church, as it had been, a few years before he promulgated his Bull, declared at the Council of Trent. It is of course written in Latin, but the following is a correct translation of it :

“ 1. I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and the rest of the observations and constitutions of the same Church.

“ 2. I also admit (or receive) the Holy Scriptures according to that sense which the Holy Mother Church, (to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense,) hath held, and doth hold ; nor will I ever understand and interpret it otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

“ 3. I profess, also, that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the New Law instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary to the salvation of mankind, though not all of them necessary to every man, viz : Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace ; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be repeated without sacrilege.

“ 4. I likewise receive and admit all the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, in the solemn administration of all the above-said Sacraments.

“ 5. All and everything which was defined and declared about original sin by the most holy Council of Trent, I embrace and receive.

“ 6. I profess, likewise, that in the Mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice, for the quick and the dead ; and that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that there is a conversion made of the whole substance of bread into his body, which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation.

“ 7. I confess, also that under either kind (or species) only, whole and entire Christ, and the true Sacrament, is received.

“ 8. I steadfastly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

"9. As, also, that the Saints who reign together with Christ, are to be venerated and invocated; and that they offer prayers to God for us; and that their reliques are to be venerated.

"10. I, also, most firmly assert that the image of Christ, and the Mother of God, the always Virgin, as also other Saints, are to be had and retained, and due honor and veneration to be bestowed upon them.

"11. I affirm, also, that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in his Church, and that their use is most wholesome to Christian people.

"12. I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and I promise and swear true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, Successor of St. Peter, the Prince of Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

"13. All the rest, also, delivered, defined and declared, by the sacred canons and œcumenical Councils, especially by the most holy Synod of Trent, I receive and profess without doubt. And, likewise, all things contrary, and whatsoever heresies, condemned, rejected, and anathematized, by the Church, I, in like manner, condemn, reject, and anathematize.

"This true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved, which at present I freely profess and truly hold, I will most constantly retain and confess entire and inviolable (by God's help) to my last breath; and take care, as much as lieth in me, that it be held, taught, and preached, by my subjects, or those whose care belongs to me as my office.

"I do promise, vow, and swear. So help me God and these Holy Gospels."

According to the Bull of Pope Pius IV, every ecclesiastic, of whatever grade, is to receive and swear to this creed, and solemnly to profess his obedience to the Roman Church in this form, and no other, under the penalty of the curse of the Council of Trent. He concludes the Bull in words to this effect: "To no man on earth is it permitted to infringe this expression of our will and mandate, or presumptuously to gainsay it. If any one shall presume to attempt it, let him

know that he will incur the indignation of the Omnipotent God, and of the blessed Peter and Paul his Apostles." So that if any one ventures to affirm the possibility of a Protestant's salvation, (and I have no doubt that there are many Roman Catholics, whose kind and unsophisticated hearts revolt from the idea of denying it,) if any one does not fully receive these impositions of this apostate Church, she denounces against him the anger of God.

There are various matters in this creed, the consideration of which will naturally be taken up in subsequent lectures. In the mean time, as belonging to our present subject, I have to call your attention to the relative position which is here given, on the one hand, to what are called, in the first article, "the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical traditions, and the rest of the observations and constitutions of the Romish Church," and, on the other hand, to the Scriptures—the Word of God. The former are to be received simply, without qualification, and as foundation principles; the latter are to be received only according to that sense which the Holy Mother Church hath held, and doth hold; nor are they ever to be understood and interpreted otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. The last clause may be considered as excluding the Scriptures altogether from any attempt at interpretation, for it will try the research of the most learned priest in the Romish Church, to produce an interpretation of a single chapter in the Bible, in support of which he can plead the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Not even the standard text, *Matt. xvi. 18*—"Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," can boast of an interpretation in which the Fathers are unanimous. According to Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Chrysostom and others, the "rock" means the truth which Peter had just acknowledged—the fundamental article of the Christian faith—"Thou art the Christ, the

Son of the living God." According to Jerome and Augustin, it means Christ himself, whom Peter had just confessed, and who is that foundation other than which can no man lay. There were few in the early Church who had adopted the unscriptural, the anti-scriptural, view to which the Romish Church adheres—that Peter himself is the rock on which the Church is built. The truth is, it is the policy of Rome to restrain men from really interpreting, or endeavoring to understand, the Scriptures.

God, in his Word, speaks directly to man as *His own* creature, and as a sinner; and tells him what he must do to be saved. "Wisdom standeth in the top of high places, by the way in the places of the paths; she crieth at the gates, at the entry of the city, at the coming in at the doors:" and her proclamation is, "Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of man." It is true, a ministry has been appointed to expound these truths with the living voice, and to press them upon the conscience; but they who constitute the ministry must be ministers of the *Word*. The declaration under the Old Testament was, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." Upon the same principle, the charge is given to the members of the Church under the New Testament: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." The charge which our Saviour addressed to the Jews, his Word repeats to us: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." The Apostle Paul also speaks of it as a great advantage which Timothy had enjoyed, in that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus; declaring, at the same time, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is

profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

In opposition to all this, however, the Church of Rome, instead of submitting her teaching to be tried by the standard of God's word, insists upon it that the Bible shall have no meaning but that she which is pleased to ascribe to it. She knows that there is an irreconcilable antagonism betwixt her teaching and what it teaches; and she permits no one to read it, except such as she has reason to believe will receive it only with her interpretation. The pretence is the difficulty of understanding the Bible, and the danger of wresting it; and the remedy which she provides is, that instead of appealing to the Scriptures in the portable shape in which God has been pleased to communicate them, and translated into the language of the people who are to read them, we try to find a guide in the decrees of the Councils, the Bulls of the Popes, and the other authoritative writings of the Romish Church, extending to about 150 folio volumes, in a dead language; in which we have still to separate the genuine from the forged documents, with which they are intermixed, to ascertain amongst the contradictory though genuine documents, which of them are to be adhered to as our infallible guide; and when the so called infallible documents are at length found, to encounter still greater difficulty in ascertaining their meaning than in the case of the word of God which they are intended to supersede.

The late Archbishop Walsh, in his Pastoral address in 1853, tried to put on a bold front, and to assume the appearance of repelling a charge such as this; but his own statements and admissions really establish its truth. At page 49, he says—

"Now, with regard to the reading of the Scriptures; it is one thing to read and another to interpret. The reading of the Scriptures with humble dispositions, and due respect for

the authority established by Christ, the Catholic church has never forbidden. But she has always opposed and condemned the rash and unauthorized interpretation of the Sacred Volume by private individuals, and it was thus on account of their opposition to the written word, or their obstinate perversion of its meaning, that she proscribed the heretics of every age and country. In this respect she has treated all her children alike, and the privilege which she denies to all who are outside her pale, and to the laity within, is equally refused to her clergy ; for no one, no matter what his rank or learning, is permitted to interpret Scripture in opposition to any dogma of faith, or the universally received tradition of the Catholic Church from the time of the Apostles. But, if the version be accurate, and approved by proper ecclesiastical authority ; if those passages in the Sacred volume which are difficult and obscure to ordinary readers, and which have been distorted and perverted in modern times, so as to favour the vain conceits of dogmatizers, and impugn the fundamental doctrines of Christianity—if to such passages which the unlearned and unstable might wrest to their own perdition, there be explanatory notes accurately stating the Church's doctrine, and guarding the weak, the unlettered and simple mind against the dangerous seductions of error ; if this be done, the Catholic Church not only does not forbid, but most earnestly recommends the devout reading of the Scriptures. However, as poison and honey may be extracted from the same flower ; as the holiest things on earth have been perverted and abused by the wickedness or weakness of men ; as melancholy experience has proved in every century, and in every clime that the indiscriminate attempt of individuals to expound religious dogmas, and invent religious creeds, invariably ended in disunion, and scandal, in turbulence and immorality, in ruin to the individuals themselves, and heart-rending disasters to society at large, so the Catholic Church in her profound wisdom, neither indiscriminately prohibits, nor indiscriminately enjoins the reading of the Scripture."

Now, it is not charged against the Church of Rome that she has ever issued an absolute and indiscriminate prohibition as to the reading of the Scriptures. She has some extracts from them inserted in her devotional services. The Bishop,

or the Inquisitor, may allow such persons as he may judge to be too well established in the doctrine of the Church, to have their faith in her teaching shaken by what they may read even in the Bible,—he may allow such persons as these to possess and to read the Scriptures, in an approved translation, but to all other persons the prohibition is absolute. A decree of the Council of Trent declares that he who, *without such permission, shall presume either to read or to possess the Scriptures* cannot, unless he first deliver up his Bible to his ordinary, receive the priestly absolution. Still farther, we learn from DENS' Theology that this law is received, and (with some variety according to the circumstances of different countries) acted upon in by far the greatest extent of the Catholic world, only, (and the exception is significant) *some more liberty is allowed where Romanists live among heretics.*

Nor let any one imagine that this interference with man's religious liberty can have a bearing only on those who may choose to attach themselves to the Church, and thus to recognise its jurisdiction. It is a principle of this Church that all who have been baptized, and as baptized have been connected with any Church, however heretical she may account that Church to be, are on this very ground, of right, subject to her jurisdiction. They may deny her authority, but for doing so she charges them with desertion and rebellion; and she maintains that when she can get them into her power she has a right to treat them as rebels and deserters. In the work of Peter Dens just quoted, and of which some of you may have heard as an approved work on Roman Catholic doctrine, the question is proposed, "Are unbelievers to be compelled to embrace the faith?" Having first noticed the case of unbelievers who have never been baptized, the writer says,* "We answer secondly to the question, that unbelievers who have been baptized, as heretics and apostates generally are, and

* Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica, PETRI DENS, II, 80.

also baptized schismatics, *can be compelled by corporal punishment to return to the Catholic faith and the unity of the Church.* The reason is, that they by baptism are made subjects of the Church, and therefore the Church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them, by the appointed means, to obedience, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism. This also obtains in the case of those who have been baptized in their infancy or who, compelled by fear or any necessity have received baptism; as the Council of Trent teaches, Session 7, Canon 14; and the 4th Council of Toledo, Canon 55. You may object—‘No one believes against his will, but the will cannot be compelled, therefore no one can be compelled to the faith.’ We answer by denying the consequent, for he is *not compelled to believe against his will*, but that FROM BEING UNWILLING, HE SHOULD BE MADE WILLING. You will urge again—‘No one can be compelled to baptism, therefore no one to the faith.’ We answer with St. Thomas on this:—as to vow is the part of a willing mind, but to pay what is vowed is of necessity; so, to receive the faith is the part of the will, but to hold it when received, is of necessity, and therefore *heretics can be compelled to hold the faith.*” And if any of my hearers should be disposed to think—surely this principle at least is no longer held, otherwise we would find Roman Catholics every where employing physical force to compel heretics to be willing to hold the Romish faith, the same renowned Master Peter Dens has the true explanation ready. He adds, “Meanwhile *it is not always expedient* that the Church should use this right, as will appear from what shall be said hereafter.” The claim of right is not renounced; the exercise of the right depends on questions of expediency.

Again, although the Church of Rome does not recognize baptism by those whom she accounts heretics, as placing those who are thus baptized within the Church for saving blessings,

she maintains that it renders them *subject to the Church*, whence she justly seizes them as deserters from her camp ; and accordingly Dens tells us : * “ Heretics, Schismatics, Apostates, and all similar persons, who have been baptized, are bound by the laws of the Church which concern them, nor are they more released from her laws than subjects rebelling against their lawful Prince are released from the laws of that Prince.” “ They remain personally subject to the Church wheresoever they may be.”

Having proposed the question, What are the punishments decreed against those infected with the stain of Heresy ? Peter Dens gives the following answer : † “ Heretics that are known to be such are infamous from this very cause, and are deprived of burial connected with the rites of the Church. Their temporal goods are for this very cause confiscated ;” ‡ “ Finally, they are also justly visited with other punishments, even such as are corporal—as banishment, imprisonment, &c.” Nor does he leave us in doubt as to what may be comprehended under this “ &c.” The question is distinctly proposed, Are heretics justly punished with death ? and the answer is ready, — † “ St. Thomas answers, Yes — because forgers of money or other disturbers of the State, are justly punished with death, therefore, also, heretics, who are forgers of the faith, and, as experience testifies generally, disturb the State. This is confirmed, because God, in the Old Testament, ordered the false prophet to be slain ; and in Deut. xvii. 12, it is decreed that if any one will act proudly and will not obey the commands of the Priests, let him be put to death. See, also the eighteenth chapter. The same is proved from the condemnation of the 14th article of John Huss, in the Council of Constance.”

We have shown how much they are opposed to the reading of even their own approved version of the Bible without their

* Dens ii. 280.

† Dens, ii. 88.

‡ Ibid, ii. 89.

own explanatory notes. Here, then, is a note, which, in the fourth edition of the Douay Bible, published in Dublin in 1816, was appended to the passage just referred to in Deuteronomy: "Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the Church guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal all controversies relating to the law, promising that they should not err therein: *and punishing with death* such as proudly refuse to obey their decision; and *surely he has not done less for the Church guides of the New Testament.*"

But the theory of the Papacy is not exhausted when we speak of the Pope as being the Head of the Church, and the proper depositary of all the power which is claimed for it. The Pope, as the representative and Vicar of Christ, who is not only Head of the Church, but is the head over all things to his Church, claims a supremacy in temporal things also; he claims to have a right, when he may see it expedient, to interfere in all temporal matters, and even to dispose of crowns and of kingdoms. The Papacy is both spiritual and secular. "It is," as it has been well expressed,* "a tyranny which fetters humanity in its religious, its social, and its political elements." The claim to political supremacy, notwithstanding disclaimers by certain Roman writers, who have their own present objects to serve, has been ostentatiously urged and formally declared by the Bishop of Rome, as resting upon divine right, and as necessarily included in his ecclesiastical office. The full amount of the claim was not stated all at once. What had only been, as it were, in the germ at an early period, was propounded with great boldness by Gregory VII., towards the close of the eleventh century; so that in his day the supremacy of the Pope over the Church, and the Church over the State, assumed the shape of a

* *Europe's Crisis*, by the Rev. James Wright: a valuable work, and very reasonable.

perfectly organized system. In his quarrel with Henry IV., the Emperor of Germany, he asserted his supremacy to such an extent that he excommunicated the Emperor, absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and forbid any one to serve him as King; nor was the excommunication removed till Henry had made the most abject submission to him at the Castle of Canosa. Innocent III., in the thirteenth century, asserted the same principle towards John, the King of England, whom he brought to submission by first laying his Kingdom under an interdict, then actually deposing him from his throne, and making his kingdom over to the King of France. At a later period, that is, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the principle on which this claim was founded was thus set forth by Boniface VIII., in his Bull, *Unam Sanctam*:* “There is one fold, and one shepherd. The authority of that shepherd includes the two swords,—the spiritual and the temporal. So much are we taught by the words of the Evangelist, ‘Behold here are two swords,’ namely, in the Church. The Lord did not reply, ‘It is too much,’ but ‘It is enough.’ Certainly he did not deny to Peter the temporal sword: he only commanded him to return it into his scabbard. Both, therefore, belong to the jurisdiction of the Church—the spiritual sword and the secular. The one is to be wielded for the Church, the other by the Church,—the one is the sword of the Priest, the other is in the hand of the Monarch, but at the command and sufferance of the Priest. It behoves the one sword to be under the other—the temporal authority to be subject to the spiritual power.” “Moreover, we say, determine and pronounce, that every human creature is subject to the Roman Pontiff, as of absolute necessity to salvation.”

Now, this supremacy must not be identified with the temporal dominion which belongs to the Pope, as sovereign

* Gieseler's Ecclesiastical History, iii. 146; also, Wylie's Prize Essay on the Papacy—p. 98.

of what are called the States of the Church, in Italy. His temporal authority as a petty sovereign is indeed one of the features by which we are enabled to identify him, as he is described in the Bible, and it is important, as enabling us to understand, when we look at the condition in which his own immediate subjects are held, how hostile Popery is, where it has full sway, to liberty whether civil or religious. But the supremacy of which we speak belongs to the Pope, and is claimed by him, not as a petty Italian Prince, but as the successor of St. Peter, and the Vicar of Christ; it would still be claimed by him were he again, as he has been already, and as more than one Pope has been before him, an exile altogether from Rome. It is when we look at what is implied in the Papal supremacy, that we understand it as a system which is political as well as religious. * “The nature of the Popish creed, as described in the volume of inspiration, as defined by Popish officials themselves, and as admitted by all intelligent Protestants, compels her every honest adherent to be a politician, and *a politician he must of necessity be against the just prerogatives of Protestant Princes, and against the just rights of Protestant subjects.*”

II. Having thus far looked at some of the principles involved in the Papacy, let us now, in the second place, attend to the agents in this conspiracy. And here we find the whole hierarchy, from the humblest Priest upwards, banded together, as sworn conspirators, in support of this system.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV., as we have seen, binds every Priest to draw his principles not from God's Word, but from the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions; or from God's Word, not as he himself might see its meaning to be, but according to that sense which the Holy Mother Church hath held and doth hold; and while he acknowledges the

* Europe's Crisis, p. 224.

Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, he promises and swears true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, as successor to Peter, the Prince of Apostles, and as the Vicar of Jesus Christ. He binds himself up, therefore, from all liberty of thinking or of acting, whether in civil or religious matters, except as in accordance with these principles. It is under these restrictions that he is appointed to guide the people who are placed under his care. His object must be to bind them to the chariot wheels of the Papacy. He is the administrator of ordinances in the very participation in which, as a mere *opus operatum*, they obtain assured spiritual benefit. Before admitting them to these, he can bring them to their knees at the confessional; and there, under the penalty of having their sins firmly bound upon their souls if they act insincerely, he can extract from them an account, not only of all that they have been doing, but even of the secret thoughts of their hearts. He has thus every appliance for fixing them in the same bondage with himself, and nipping in the bud the first appearances of what, if let alone, might be found ripening into that assertion of liberty to think and act for himself, which belongs to man as a moral and accountable being; and without which he is most unquestionably very unfit for administering the affairs of a free people.

As the members of the priesthood advance in rank, they have of course an increased influence. They move in a higher sphere; and the obligations, accordingly, which are laid upon them, require that they improve their extended opportunities for the advancement still of the grand object. The following, for instance, is the oath of allegiance which Bishops take to the Pope:—

* “I, (name) elect of the Church of (name), from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle,

• BARROW on the Supremacy, pp. 30, 31.

and to the Holy Roman Church, and to our Lord the Lord (name) Pope —, and to his successors, canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, nor do anything that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them, under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel which they will intrust me withal, by themselves, their successors, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy, and the Royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the Apostolic See, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any council, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said Roman Church, anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other, by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose." &c.

The Cardinals are the princes of the Papacy; and in whatever country they may have their residence, whatever allegiance they may profess to the proper sovereign of that country, that they pledge their most devoted allegiance to the Pope, that they are in fact emissaries and spies for the court of Rome in the countries where they reside, must be evident from the following copy of the oath taken by lately appointed Cardinals in Sardinia: *

"I —, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, do promise and swear that, from this hour until my life's end, I will

* WILKIE on the Papacy, pp. 122-3.

be faithful and obedient unto St. Peter, the Holy Apostolic Roman Church, and our most Holy Lord the Pope and his successors, canonically and lawfully elected; that I will give no advice, consent, or assistance against the Pontifical Majesty and person; that I will never knowingly and advisedly, to their injury and disgrace, make public the counsels entrusted to me by themselves, or by messengers or letters from them; also that I will give them any assistance in retaining, defending, and recovering the Roman Papacy and the Regalia of St. Peter, all my might and endeavour, so far as the rights and privileges of my order will allow it, and will defend against all their honor and state; that I will direct and defend, with due favour and honour, the legates and nuncios of the Apostolic See, in the territories, churches, monasteries, and other benefices committed to my keeping; that I will cordially co-operate with them, and treat them with honour in their coming, abiding, and returning; and that I will resist unto blood all persons whatsoever who shall attempt anything against them; that I will by every way, and by every means, strive to preserve, augment, and advance the rights, honours, privileges, the authority of the Holy Roman Bishop our Lord the Pope, and his beforementioned successors; and that at whatsoever time anything shall be devised to their prejudice, which it is out of my power to hinder, as soon as I shall know that any steps or measures have been taken in the matter, I will make it known to the same our Lord, or his before-mentioned successors, or to some other person by whose means it may be brought to their knowledge.

“That I will keep and carry out, and cause others to keep and carry out, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the decrees, ordinances, dispensations, reservations, provisions, apostolical mandates, and constitutions of the Holy Pontiff Sextus, of happy memory, as to visiting the thresholds of the apostles, at certain prescribed times, according to the tenor of that which I have just read through.

“That I will seek out and oppose (or persecute and fight against) heretics, schismatics against the same our Lord the Pope and his before-mentioned successors, with every possible effort.” Then, after some further articles, the person taking the oath concludes thus: “I will not seek absolution from any of the foregoing articles, but reject it if it should be offered me. So help me God and the most holy Gospels.

According to these documents, then, the whole Romish priesthood must be regarded as a band of conspirators, spread over the world, but bound together by the most solemn oaths, to do what? Why, in spiritual matters, to maintain the authority of the Pope as head of the Church; to propagate the doctrines of the Church; to allow even the Bible to speak nothing but according to the meaning which the Church is pleased to ascribe to its words; to stigmatize and excommunicate as heretics all who refuse to go along with them in these things: bound still further, in civil matters, to assert the supremacy of the Pope over all temporal sovereigns; to maintain his right, as the Vicar of Christ, to compel kings to yield obedience to his mandates, and to employ the civil sword for him in persecuting, even to the death, those who refuse to acknowledge this headship, and who, in consequence of this refusal, are branded as heretics; bound to exert every effort to secure to the Pope all the rights and privileges which at present he maintains, to recover and restore to him what may have been in abeyance, or may have been wrested from him, and even to extend and advance them still further.

But we must look a little more closely at the means which these men may regard it as within their competency to employ. In the oaths taken by the Cardinals and Bishops, you may have observed an engagement to retain, defend and recover the regalia or the royalties of St. Peter, as what belong to the Pope. And what, then, are these royalties? Barrow, in his work on the supremacy of the Pope, p. 29, quoting from Bellarmine, enumerates the following as a specimen:

“To be superior to the whole church and its representative, a general synod of Bishops; to convocate general synods, at his pleasure, all Bishops being obliged to attend upon summons from him; to preside at synods, so as to suggest matter, promote, obstruct, overrule the debates in them; to confirm or invalidate their determinations, giving life to them by his assent, or subtracting it by his dissent; to define points of

doctrine, or to decide controversies authoritatively, so that none may presume to contest or dissent from his dictates; to enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, dispense with ecclesiastical laws and canons; to relax or evacuate ecclesiastical censure by indulgence, pardon, &c.; to void promises, vows, oaths, obligations to laws by his dispensation; to be the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and dignity; to constitute, confirm, judge, censure, suspend, depose, remove, restore, reconcile Bishops; to confer ecclesiastical dignities and benefices by paramount authority, in way of provision, reservation, &c.; to exempt colleges, monasteries, &c., from jurisdiction of their Bishops and ordinary superiors; to judge all persons in all spiritual causes, by calling them to his cognizance, or delegating judges for them, with a final and peremptory sentence; to receive appeals from all ecclesiastical judicatories and to reverse their judgments, if he find cause; to be himself unaccountable for any of his doings, exempt from judgment, and liable to no reproof; to erect, transfer, abolish episcopal sees; to exact oaths of fealty and obedience from the clergy; to found religious orders, or to raise a spiritual militia for propagation and defence of the Church; to summon and commissionate soldiers by croisade, &c., to fight against infidels, and to persecute infidels."

Now, while in claims such as these, we see Popery in a light that corresponds most accurately with the description which the Word of God gives of the man of sin, as one "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God;" we see, also, what kind of agents these men may be in carrying out their objects. Among the royalties here asserted for the Pope, is THE POWER OF VOIDING PROMISES, VOWS, OATHS, OBLIGATIONS TO LAW, BY HIS DISPENSATIONS. It is possible that you may have heard it denied by Roman Catholics that any such power is held to belong to the Pope. In the case of the Papacy, which claims infallibility, and consequently immutability, even ancient writings, which testify abundantly to the fact of the claim, might be sufficient to establish the point. I shall give you,

however, a late authority: Alphonso Liguori was a living author about seventy or seventy-two years ago, and he was raised to the rank of a Saint about twenty years ago. In 1803 the sacred congregation of rites declared "that in all the writings of Alphonso Liguori, edited and inedited, there was not a word that could justly be found fault with." In 1831 the sacred congregation still further answers in the negative to this question, "Is there any occasion for inquietude in the confessor who, in the sacred tribunal of penance, practically follows all the opinions of Blessed Alphonso Liguori, upon this sole ground, that the Holy Apostolic See hath declared that not a word in all his works can justly be found fault with?" His opinions, therefore, may be safely acted on. Yet this Liguori tells, in book 4, No. 256, "That the power of dispensing belongs to all prelates who have jurisdiction in *foro externo*, or the privilege of it from the Pope. Hence, the following persons can grant dispensations: 1. The Pope, to all the faithful, from all vows whatsoever. 2. Bishops, to their own subjects. 3. Exempted Superiors of religious houses to their own religious and novices." In book 1, No. 189, he says, "It is certain that the Pope and his prelates can dispense with vows, since herein they hold the place of God." And in book 6, No. 1119, he says, "It is asked if the Pope can ever dispense in things which are established by God, of *jus divinum*? In these things in which the *jus divinum* has its origin in human will, as in vows and oaths, it is certain with all that the Pope has the faculty of dispensing with them." He adds, still further, "In those things which are absolutely *jure divino*, [such as the law of nature itself.] Sanchez, and many others, say, with great probability, that the Pope has the power, in any particular case, *not indeed of dispensing with them, but of declaring that THE DIVINE LAW NO LONGER BINDS.*" You must observe that according to Jesuitical morality, which Liguori understood well, a person

is quite safe in acting upon an opinion which, as being maintained by some eminent doctor, is probably right, even though he himself should not concur with the doctor in his opinion. The teaching here, therefore, amounts to this, that where the Pope grants the dispensation, what in other circumstances would be one of the greatest sins against nature is no sin at all. Sin you know is the transgression of the law, but here no law has been violated. In the case supposed, its action has been suspended, it ceased to impose an obligation. And is not he who impiously pretends to this power justly described as one who sets himself above all that is called God? And are not men who can embrace principles such as these, wondrously adapted for working out the scheme of the mystery of iniquity?

But besides the secular clergy the cause of the Papacy is maintained and promoted by whole hosts of what are called regular clergy, that is, the various orders of monks and friars who are bound by the three grand rules of poverty, chastity, and obedience. While we have no doubt that their professions of a rigid observance of the first and second rules help to secure for them considerable influence with the people, we have as little doubt that their training under the authority of the third rule, by which their wills are subdued, and they are brought to unreserved obedience to their ecclesiastical superiors, renders them very fit instruments in carrying out the objects of this conspiracy. The Dominicans particularly have signalized their devotion to the cause, by their eagerness in hunting out heretics, by the cruelties which they have practised upon them when in their power, and by the zeal which they have manifested in perpetrating the deeds of the Inquisition. Even they, however, must yield the palm to the followers of Ignatius Loyola.

It was in 1534 that that fanatic founded the order of the Jesuits, but it was not till six years thereafter that they were

established, by the Bull of Paul III. In addition to the three usual oaths of poverty, chastity, and obedience; they take an oath of special obedience to the Pope. Amid all his subjects, they are peculiarly his devoted vassals, and are both bound and trained to the most unreasoning obedience. Seymour, in his "mornings with the Jesuits at Rome," p. 17, tells us that an accomplished member of that order stated to him, "that the great and cardinal principle was, that OBEDIENCE was the greatest Christian duty, and HUMILITY the highest Christian virtue, and that this principle was the grand element of their power. He showed how in their early schooling they trained the mind to the most strict and rigid obedience, binding everything so as to impart the principle of obedience, and create the habit of obedience: and in the end, admission to the Order is secured only through the vows of the most implicit and unquestioning obedience. When admitted into the Order there is no right to judge or question, to demur or hesitate, as to any command that may be issued by the General and Council of the Order; the duty of every member being to render, in all humility, a simple and unhesitating obedience." As to any objection that commands might be given in opposition to his judgment, revolting to his feelings, and wholly hostile to his deliberately formed opinions, his answer was, (p. 33,) "That it argued greater humility, modesty, and self-denial to render obedience under such circumstances, and therefore such obedience was held to be more meritorious in the sight of God. He stated that if such a command was issued to him, he would feel it his undoubted duty to forego his own judgment, to neglect his own feelings, to abandon his own family, to renounce the interests of his country, and to give an implicit and unquestioning obedience; that such self-denial was meritorious, and that he felt the amount of merit accruing to him, would be great in proportion to the pain and difficulty he experienced, in so

umbling himself as to render such obedience to the desires of the Order."

Now, we ask, what can be expected from the successful operation of such men but the extinction of Christian morality, and the fastening down of society, in all its relations, in the chains of the most absolute despotism? These most earnest and devoted men are so very virtuous, forsooth, that they will never trouble themselves to exercise their own mind in inquiring whether what they are ordered to do is a thing which, in itself, is right or wrong. The more merit to them if it is something abhorrent to nature. They have such a strong sense of duty, that they can think of nothing but obedience to the orders of their superiors. When they set out to fulfil these orders, they do not need to be very scrupulous as to the means; the same worthy Saint Liguori (book 4, No. 151) instructing them in this wise: "It is certain, and commonly held by all, that it is lawful to use equivocation, and to confirm it with an oath. The reason is, that we do receive our neighbor; but for some good reason *suffer him to be deceived*, and are not obliged to speak to his understanding, if there be just cause: such cause being afforded by any honest purpose to *preserve good things useful for the soul or body*." Book 4, No. 153: "A confessor may affirm, even upon oath, that he has no knowledge of a sin which he has heard of in confession—meaning, *as a man*, not as a minister of Christ. The reason is, the interrogator has no right to know ought but communicable knowledge, and that obtained in confession is not such." In like manner, book 4, No. 147, "A penitent when asked by a confessor about a sin that that has been already confessed, may swear that he did not commit it; meaning, in his own mind, that which he has not confessed." Book 4, 154: "A criminal or a witness interrogated not legitimately by a judge, [and the church teaches that, although her members may submit to circum-

stances, no judge can act legitimately who does not hold his authority as under the supremacy of the Pope] may swear that he knows nothing of the crime, though he does know it, meaning that *he knows no crime, of which, in the circumstances, he can be legitimately examined;*" or that "*he does not know it so as to give evidence about it.*" Book 4, No. 201: "If any one intends indeed to promise, yet not to bind himself by the promise, his vow is null and void." These instructions may serve to explain the difficulty of getting evidence from certain parties on criminal trials. In expounding what, as a Romanist, he calls the fifth, but which is really the sixth commandment of the moral law, the same precious Saint Liguori declares, (book 4, No. 364,) "that they only are to be accounted assassins who commit a homicide on the stipulation that he who employs them shall pay them a temporal reward." The significant remark of Pascal the Younger upon this is, that "a Priest's blessing, or the promise of heaven, would not be a temporal consideration." Once more, book 4, No. 381, "Although on account of any insult, for example, if any one should say to a gentleman, You lie, it is not lawful to kill another person; because the affront may be, and usually is, wiped off in another manner; yet if the aggressor should try to apply a stick or a blow to a man of honorable rank, and he is not able otherwise to avert the insult, Diana, Lessius, Hurtado, and twelve others, agree that it is lawful.

Such, then, are the men who are every where now spread over the world, with the design of bringing its inhabitants into subjection to the Pope. From the time of the institution of the order in 1534, they made rapid progress, and were to be found everywhere; while they seem to have laid themselves out particularly to secure for themselves the education of the young, and the direction of affairs in the courts of Princes. Their intrigues, and the disturbances which they created, led their expulsion from England in 1604; from

Venice, two years later; from Portugal, in 1759; from France, in 1754; from Sicily and Spain, in 1767; although they soon returned again to some of these countries. Even the Popes found that these seemingly devoted adherents were not so much the servants of the individual Pope, as of the Papacy; and that their real head was the General of the order.  Ganganelli, known as Pope Clement XIV, suppressed the order in 1773, but his death, supposed to have been from poison, followed soon after. Pope Pius VII restored the order, for Russia, in 1801, and for all the world in 1814; so that again they are the most influential element in carrying out the designs of the Papacy.

III. Having thus with all possible brevity noticed, first, the principle, and secondly, the organization of this conspiracy, let us now, in the third place, say a few words as to the fruits. And here we have to remind you that, as claiming infallibility, the Papacy not only consistently must, but actually does claim immutability; and that it will not do to tell us, as some not very intelligent Protestants would have us to believe, that Popery is greatly improved from what it once was, and that it is not by a reference to the sayings and doings of what are called the dark ages, that we are to learn what it now is. She herself denies the allegation. She sees indeed the expediency, and she yields to the necessity, in particular circumstances, of holding some of her claims in abeyance, or relaxing some of her restrictions, and, as Peter Dens has informed us, of allowing to her subjects who live among heretics, indulgences which she does not permit where she has them fully in her power. But anything of this nature, which may be referred to by her apologists as indications of improvement, is the mere result of external influences, and of influences which she herself regards as adverse. Yielding to the pressure from without, she may draw in her horns for a little, but only to protrude them again when the pressure is removed;

and whether the horns be drawn in, or be protruded, there they are, an important part of her system, and a characteristic of her who is represented as drunk with the blood of the saints. The time was when her call would assemble the marshalled hosts of potentates acknowledging her supremacy, to persecute even to the death the bible-loving Albigenses and Waldenses, in the south of France, or the adherents to the truth among the valleys of the Alps. Her call is not so authoritative now, but her spirit is not changed. Its unchanged character is seen even in Britain and in Ireland, not, indeed, in the burning of the persons who read the bible—she dare not attempt that—but in burning the bible itself, the priest perhaps being careful at the same time to lift the obnoxious book into the fire with the tongs, lest he should be infected with its heresy.

Who has not heard of the fires of Smithfield? Who has not heard of the treacheries and horrors of the massacre of Bartholomew, for which thanksgiving was offered up at Rome, by order of the Pope? Germany, Holland, the Netherlands, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, have their tales to tell of the atrocities that were practised within their bounds, at the instigation of this Man of Sin, to restrain liberty of thought and of action in things civil and sacred, and to bind all in fetters of absolute slavery. The dark waters of the Adriatic, too, will yet disclose the victims who, in the silence of the night, were brought from the dungeons of Venice to expiate the mortal sin of loving the Bible. They were placed on a plank between two boats. On a signal, the boats were separated by a few strokes of the oar. A plunge was heard, and the waters closed over the heretics. Does not the present state of Madeira, from which Dr. Kalley, a British subject, had difficulty in escaping with his life a few years ago, and from which multitudes of the natives had to become exiles, in e of their religious liberty, show the working still of this conspiracy? What does the experience of the Madiaⁱ

tell, on this subject? What does the experience of the Mortara family tell—deprived of their child on the ground that having been surreptitiously baptized, it has become immutably the subject of the Pope? What is the testimony from the dungeon of Poerio? What is the voice from the many dungeons in Naples and in Rome? If the Papacy is not a conspiracy against civil and religious liberty, will any one try to explain how it is that, everywhere, it is just as Popery triumphs that liberty suffers? that there is such an utter extinction of it in Naples and in Rome—the headquarters of Popery? Or how is it that it is only the Roman Catholics who dwell in lands where the Word of God has free course, and is glorified, who dare to raise their voice in favour of civil and religious liberty? They may profess to admire it here; they may use the phrase as a watchword here; they may assert their claim to it here: and find abundant sympathy. Yes! from the bottom of our hearts do we wish that they would rise up as one man, and assert their civil and religious liberty. But I have to remind them that that is a blessing which cannot be enjoyed under Popish rule—it is known only where Protestantism prevails. Even France, with all her pretensions, is a stranger to it. Not only are Protestants there, in the administration of the laws by Roman Catholics, deprived of their constitutional rights and liberties; but, according to late accounts, a distinguished writer, an earnest Roman Catholic, was about to be put on his trial for stirring up dissatisfaction among the people, because he had expressed his persuasion that there was liberty, and national progress, and prosperity in Britain, beyond what was enjoyed in France. There is no reason to suppose that the Emperor of the French, at least, has any doubt about the correctness of that opinion: but Popery cannot bear the light. Our conclusion, therefore, is, that if we Protestants, and our Roman Catholic fellow subjects, are to continue in the enjoyment of civil and

religious liberty, it is to be secured, not by placing ourselves under the influence of the Priests, but by doing what we can to secure, through the blessing of God, that the administration of our public affairs shall be in the hands of men who fear God and hate covetousness — men in whom we have confidence that they will not show contempt of God's Word, by neglecting to secure a due place for it in schools supported by provincial funds for the education of the young; and who will not, by supporting with the public funds those who teach Popish error, involve us in the guilt of aiding and abetting those who are agents in a conspiracy against civil and religious liberty.

